

Was There Really Only One Commentator Named Sthiramati?

著者 (英)	Hidenori SAKUMA
journal or publication title	Studies In Philosophy
volume	45
page range	212(39)-190(61)
year	2020-03-28
URL	http://doi.org/10.15068/00159942

Was There Really Only One Commentator Named Sthiramati?

Hidenori SAKUMA

1. A Picture of the Commentator Sthiramati

Sthiramati of the Indian Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school was roughly a contemporary of Dharmapāla and Bhāviveka, and he was also the person whose views were at the greatest variance with those of Dharmapāla. He is also well-known for having been a leading figure at the Buddhist university of Valabhī, which was one of the two main centres of Buddhism in India along with the university at Nālandā, where Dharmapāla and Śīlabhadra were based. As well, he is known as a great commentator who wrote commentaries on many treatises, including works by Vasubandhu. This is the picture of Sthiramati that has become established today. But when one examines the contents of the extant commentaries attributed to Sthiramati, one finds aspects that cause one to question the above traditional view of Sthiramati. I have previously pointed out in several articles some of the grounds for questioning the traditional view, and here I wish to reexamine our picture of the commentator Sthiramati on the basis of my previous investigations.

1.1. Traditional Accounts of Sthiramati

How was the above picture of Sthiramati created? As a starting point for considering this question, I wish to take up vol. 2 of Hirakawa Akira's *Indo Bukkyōshi* (Hirakawa 1979: 228–232), according to which the examination of Sthiramati's dates began with an article by Ui Hakuju (1965a). Ui's determination of Sthiramati's dates had its origins in G. Bühler's pronouncements on the subject (Bühler 1877). Citing the reference to “the *Bodhisattvas* Guṇamati and Sthiramati” in Xuanzang's 玄奘 *Da Tang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 and emboldened by the existence of material proof of the existence of the name “Sthiramati” in copperplate inscriptions from Valabhī, Bühler asserted that Sthiramati of Valabhī was “no doubt” the commentator Sthiramati. Bühler subsequently published several more studies in which he maintained this position. His views were endorsed by Sylvain Lévi (1896), who showed that Sthiramati had been a contemporary of the king Guhasena (r. 558–566 C.E.) of Valabhī, and on the basis of Lévi's research Erich Frauwallner (1961) estimated Sthiramati's dates to have been 510–570. This current of research was continued by Kajiyama Yūichi (1965), who, basing himself on the fact that Sthiramati, Bhāviveka, Dharmapāla, and Avalokitavrata quote and criticize each other in their writings, demonstrated that Sthiramati (510–570), Bhāviveka (480–570), and Dharmapāla (530–561) were contemporaries and thus endorsed Frauwallner's view.

If we consider the treatment of source materials by Ui (1965a: 111–114), the starting point of the above overview, we find that he based himself on the *Da Tang gu sanzang*

二
二
二

Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang 大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀 (T. no. 2052), *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 (T. no. 2053), *Da Tang xiyuji* (T. no. 2087), *Si shamen Xuanzang shangbiao ji* 寺沙門玄奘上表記 (T. no. 2119), and *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (T. no. 2060) and “consult[ed] as necessary other works.” Ui further wrote, “Because, owing to the nature of the currently available materials, it is quite difficult to obtain any definite and fixed dates for any of the events, I will do no more than merely give an indication of what seems to be true, and therefore we must needs place our hopes on research by other meticulous scholars.” Apart from the date of Xuanzang’s death (664 C.E.),¹ the dates of no other Indian masters have been established, and the dates of Sthiramati, Bhāviveka, Dharmapāla, etc., have been calculated on the basis of the above-mentioned works and what Kuiji 窺基 recorded.

But at some point Ui’s reservations expressed by qualifications such as “perhaps” and “maybe” seem to have acquired authority and turned into definitive statements. Depending on the source, Śīlabhadra (Jiexian 戒賢) is said to have been either 106 or 160 years old when Xuanzang met him, while Jayasena (Shengjun 勝軍), whom Xuanzang accompanied, was more than 100 years old, and Śīlabhadra was one year older than Dharmapāla, who died in his thirties. Ui himself states that there are scant grounds for any of these traditional accounts.

There are also questions surrounding the relationship between Sthiramati (Anhui 安慧) and Paramārtha. Yūki Reimon (1999 [1980]) pointed out that the view that Paramārtha had belonged to a current of thought deriving from Anhui, put forward in earlier studies, originated in the *Shōdaijōronshaku ryakusho* 攝大乘論釋略疏 by the Japanese scholar-monk Fujaku 普寂 (1707–81),² a fact that had also been pointed out in Ui 1965b. It was, in other words, recognized that there were no solid grounds for the above traditional accounts.

Next, the sources that have until now been adduced for linking Valabhī and Sthiramati are mainly the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* (T50.243b9: “Falapi” 伐臘毘 [Valabhī]; T50.244a9: “Anhui”) and the *Da Tang xiyuji* (T51.936b16: “Falapi”; T51.936c2: “Jianhui” 堅慧). Both of these works were compiled by Xuanzang’s disciples on the basis of Xuanzang’s own accounts, and they have been considered to record that Sthiramati was active in Valabhī, as a result of which they have served as the main grounds for linking Sthiramati to Valabhī.

In the Tibetan tradition, biographies of Sthiramati are found in the *History of Buddhism* by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) (Obermiller 1932: 147–149) and in the *History of Buddhism in India* by Tāranātha (1573–1615?) (Teramoto 1974: 195–198). According to these works, Sthiramati wrote commentaries on most of Vasubandhu’s works and also wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. But both Bu ston and Tāranātha question whether the author of the latter commentary was the same Sthiramati. According to Bhavya’s biography in the *History of Buddhism in India* (Teramoto: 205–208), Bhavya’s disciples went to Nālandā and defeated Sthiramati’s disciples in debate. Both Bu ston and Tāranātha are of the view that these accounts require further examination. According to Teramoto’s translation of the *History of Buddhism in India*, Sthiramati had ties with Nālandā. To the best of my knowledge, there are no accounts in the Tibetan tradition that link Sthiramati to Valabhī.³

1.2. Sthiramati Appearing in Inscriptions

Evidence linking Sthiramati to Valabhī is provided by inscriptions from Valabhī. There exists earlier research on the Valabhī inscriptions by Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄 and others, but here I will use the studies by Tsukamoto Keishō (1996: 526–542) and Marlene Njammasch (2001: 210ff.). The inscription numbers used below are those assigned by Tsukamoto.

First, as regards the inscriptions' dates, inscription no. 7 (copperplate inscription) is said to date from the year 269 of the Valabha era and inscription no. 21 (copperplate inscription) from the year 343 of the same era. According to *Alberuni's India* (vol. 2: 7), the epoch of the Valabha era falls 241 years later than the epoch of the Śaka (or Śālivāhana) era, which is considered to have begun in 78 C.E. This means that inscription no. 7 dates from 588 C.E. (269+241+78 = 588) and inscription no. 21 from 662 C.E. (343+241+78 = 662). These dates may be regarded as definitive in terms of the currently recognized chronology.

Inscription no. 7 (588 C.E.; Tsukamoto 1996: 524)

(Summary) “Recipient of the grant: The monastery Śrī-Bappapāda in Valabhī, founded by the Master and Venerable Sthiramati”

Valabhīyāṃ ācāryya-bhadanta-Sthiramati-kārita-śrī-Bappapādiya-vihāre

Inscription no. 21 (662 C.E.; Tsukamoto 1996: 541)

(Summary) “Recipient of the grant: Monastery founded by the Master and Monk Vimalagupta of the village Kukkurāṇaka, within the monastery founded by the Master and Venerable Sthiramati, included in the Duḍḍa monastery complex”

1. *Duḍḍāvihāraṃaṇḍalāntarggat' ācāryya-bhikṣu-Sthiramati-kārita-vihāre ācāryyabhikṣu-Vimalagupta-kārita-bhagava...*
2. *Duḍḍāvihāraṃaṇḍala-praveśya-Kukkurāṇakagrāma-niviṣṭ' ācāryyabhikṣu-Vimalagupta-kārita-*

Tsukamoto (1996: 527) writes with respect to inscription no. 21, “(6) Sthiramativihāra: monastery founded by the master and monk Sthiramati (different person from the Sthiramati of (11)),” and with respect to inscription no. 7, “(11) śrī-Bappapādiya-vihāra: monastery named after Bappapāda, an ancestor of the Maitraka dynasty, and revered by members of the royal family; founded by the master and venerable Sthiramati (different person from the Sthiramati of (6)).” Unfortunately, Tsukamoto does not explain why he considers the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 7 to have been a different person from the Sthiramati mentioned in inscription no. 21.

Njammasch (2001: 20–21), on the other hand, considers the Sthiramatis mentioned in these two inscriptions to have been the same person. She begins her examination by posing the question of whether or not the Sthiramatis appearing in the two inscriptions are the same person (“Aus der Inschrift des Jahres 588 n.Chr. ergibt sich auch die Frage, ob das von Sthiramati erbaute Śrī-Bappapādiya-vihāra mit dem im Jahre 662 n.Chr. erwähnten Kloster identisch ist, von dem es ebenfalls heißt, das es von Sthiramati erbaut worden war.”). Having considered the relationship between the monasteries mentioned in the two inscriptions, she notes that because there is a gap of 74 years (662 – 588 = 74) between the dates of the two inscriptions, it

is conceivable that the Sthiramati in the 588 inscription may not have been the Sthiramati mentioned in the 662 inscription (“Es wären natürlich auch noch andere Deutungen möglich, z.B. muß der Sthiramati des Jahres 588 nicht der des Jahres 662 n.Chr. gewesen sein.”). But her formulation implies that they were the same person. Then, using the *Da Tang xiyuji*, based on Xuanzang’s account, as her main evidence, Njammasch states that the Sthiramati appearing in these two inscriptions is the Sthiramati mentioned by Xuanzang and the renowned Sthiramati of the Yogācāra school who wrote commentaries on Vasubandhu’s works and that he lived in the sixth century (“Sthiramati war Philosoph der buddhistischen *Yogācāraschule* und lebte im 6. Jh. n.Chr.”). She also maintains that in the 630s when Xuanzang was in India he knew that Sthiramati had lived in Valabhī and certainly taught there (“In den dreißiger Jahren des 7. Jh. n.Chr. war dem Xuan Zang noch bekannt, daß Sthiramati in Valabhī gelebt und sicherlich gelehrt hatte.”). She further adds that Xuanzang also mentions Sthiramati as one of the famous teachers at the Buddhist university of Nālandā (“Xuan Zang erwähnt übrigens Sthiramati auch unter den berühmten Lehrern der buddhistischen Universität von Nālandā.”). In other words, the chief grounds for Njammasch’s equating of the Sthiramatis mentioned in the two inscriptions is the traditional view shaped by Xuanzang’s account and other Chinese sources.

In view of the fact that the Tibetan tradition mentions Sthiramati in connection with Nālandā and Xuanzang, too, refers to him as a renowned teacher at Nālandā, it is quite conceivable, even without invoking the image of an itinerant monk, that Sthiramati travelled between the Buddhist universities at Valabhī and Nālandā as circumstances required.

When the traditional accounts are considered in conjunction with the inscriptions, it does indeed seem plausible that the Sthiramati who wrote several commentaries on Vasubandhu’s works was the same person as the Sthiramati mentioned in the inscriptions. But there is no textual evidence that the author of the commentaries attributed to Sthiramati was the Sthiramati mentioned in the inscriptions, nor is there any guarantee that the Sthiramati mentioned in the two inscriptions was one and the same person.

1.3. Textual Evidence in Debates between the Madhyamaka and Yogācāra Schools

The works to be considered here are Bhāviveka’s *Madhyamakahr̥daya-kārikā*, *Prajñāpradīpa*, and (in Chinese translation) *Dasheng zhangzhen lun* 大乘掌珍論, Sthiramati’s *Dasheng zhongguan shilun* 大乘中觀釋論, Dharmapāla’s *Dasheng guang bailun shilun* 大乘廣百論釋論, and Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvatāra* (as well as his *Prasannapadā* and *Śūnyatāsaptatvṛtti*). Studies of Madhyamaka criticism of the Yogācāra school based on these works include those by Yamaguchi Susumu (1941), Yasui Kōsai (1961), Kajiyama Yūichi (1963), Ejima Yasunori (2003 [1992]), and Kishine Toshiyuki (2001).

There are several aspects of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda thought that are raised by the Mādhyamikas Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti as targets of their criticism, among which the following would seem necessary to be considered in the present context. As is indicated by Yamaguchi (1941: 188), the Mādhyamika method of criticism was such that when the target of its criticism was deemed to propound “existence,” it regarded its target as a realist posi-

tion and criticized its grounds, and when its target was deemed to propound “non-existence,” it took the position of investigating its grounds. The prime example is the statement in the *Madhyāntavibhāga* that false discrimination both exists and does not exist. There are also instances in which the criticism takes the form of the suggestion that an assertion of the Yogācāra school is no different from the position of the Madhyamaka school (e.g., Yamaguchi 1941: 372). If one takes the view that originally practitioners of the Yogācāra school carried over Nāgārjuna’s thinking, such criticism might end up corroborating this relationship between the two. As is noted by Ejima (2003: 536) in connection with Bhāviveka and Dharmapāla, there are many aspects in which Dignāga, Bhāviveka, Sthiramati, Dharmapāla, and Candrakīrti seem to be arguing at cross-purposes with one another. While it cannot be denied that some of the mutual criticism is merely intended to provoke an argument, it is at least certain on the basis of this textual evidence that these scholars were historical figures who actually lived, albeit perhaps at slightly different times, and were in a milieu that made it possible for them to argue with one another.⁴

Avalokitavrata’s *Prajñāpradīpa-īkā*, which survives only in Tibetan translation and is quoted by Kajiyama (1963), mentions the two masters Blo brtan (Sthiramati) and Chos skyong (Dharmapāla) and confirms that they engaged in debate with Bhāviveka (Bhavya), the author of the *Prajñāpradīpa*. However, rather than constituting exchanges of views, their respective criticisms would seem to be one-sided disquisitions on their own views, and therefore these references do not necessarily prove that they were contemporaries.

As for the *Dasheng zhongguan shilun* (T. no. 1567) by Anhui (Sthiramati), which was translated into Chinese by Weijing 惟淨 and others in the Song period, and the *Dasheng guang bailun shilun* (T. no. 1571) by Dharmapāla, translated by Xuanzang, the question of whether or not their contents are consistent with the contents of Sthiramati’s works preserved in the original Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation is one that will need to be examined in the future.

1.4. The Traditions of Chinese Vijñānavāda Doctrine

In Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, the traditions of which Japanese Hossō 法相 doctrine inherited, the view that Sthiramati (Anhui) was the scholar whose views were at the greatest variance with those of Dharmapāla (Hufa 護法) became widely established on the basis of a well-known mnemonic, according to which Sthiramati (Anhui), Nanda (Nantuo 難陀), Dignāga (Chenna 陳那), and Dharmapāla (Hufa) posited one, two, three, and four aspects of consciousness respectively. It has been assumed that this Anhui was Sthiramati and Hufa was Dharmapāla. If we apply this tradition to India, it means that Sthiramati propounded a one-aspect theory of consciousness, while Dharmapāla propounded a fourfold division of consciousness, which added to the three aspects of perceived object (*grāhya*), perceiving consciousness (*grāhaka*), and self-awareness or self-authentication (*svasaṃvedana*) a fourth aspect that authenticated self-authentication. It can be confirmed in works composed in India that Dignāga added *svasaṃvedana* (*svasaṃvid*) to *grāhya* and *grāhaka*,⁵ and this provides textual evidence for these three aspects. But the aspect that authenticates self-authentic-

tion (*zheng zizheng fen* 證自證分) cannot be found prior to Xuanzang's translations of the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* and *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論. The *Cheng weishi lun* is said to have been composed by “Hufa and others,” with the views of Hufa being deemed to represent the orthodox view, which then became established as orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine. But works attributed to Dharmapāla exist only in Chinese translation and cannot be directly equated with Dharmapāla's ideas. In addition, Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna*, which survives only in Tibetan translation and according to the traditional account ought to have inherited Dharmapāla's ideas, also shows no evidence of that aspect of consciousness that authenticates self-authentication. The fact that the equivalent of *zheng zizheng fen* appearing in Xuanzang's translation of the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* is not found in the corresponding passage of Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna* means that it is by no means certain that the views of Hufa, regarded as the orthodox views of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, and the views of Dharmapāla were identical in the contents of their ideas.

Let us consider the section on the four aspects of consciousness in the *Cheng weishi lun* (T31.10c4–12).

These four parts may be reduced to three, because the fourth may be included in the self-authenticating part. Or they may be reduced to two, because the last three are all subjects with objects; that is, all three are included in the seeing part. “Seeing” means having objects. Or they may be reduced to one, because there is no difference in their substance. As a verse in the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* says:

Mind, attached to itself,
Evolves resembling the external realm.
What is perceived by it does not exist,
And therefore it is said that there is only mind.

Thus in many places in the scriptures it is said that there is only the one mind. This “one mind” also includes mental activities. Therefore, the mode of activity of consciousness is perception, and perception is the seeing part of consciousness.⁶

如是四分或攝爲三。第四攝入自證分故。或攝爲二。後三俱是能緣性故皆見分攝。此言見者是能緣義。或攝爲一。體無別故。如入楞伽伽他中說

由自心執著 心似外境轉
彼所見非有 是故說唯心

如是處處說唯一心。此一心言亦攝心所。故識行相即是了別。了別即是識之見分。

Here it is said of the one-aspect theory “Or they (i.e., the four parts) may be reduced to one, because there is no difference in their substance” (underlined section). This “one” refers to the fact that although consciousness may be divided into four aspects—objective part, seeing part, self-authenticating part, and part that authenticates self-authentication—they are only the one mind. This explanation of the four aspects of consciousness follows on from the explanation of the three aspects of consciousness, which ends as follows (T31.10b13–16):

As a verse in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* says:

The image that resembles an external object is the cognised object;

That which grasps the image and that which is self-authenticating
Are the cogniser and the fruit [of cognition].

There is no difference in the substance of these three.

如集量論伽他中說

似境相所量 能取相自證

即能量及果 此三體無別

This corresponds to verse 10 in chapter 1 of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, in which the underlined section reads (Steinkellner et al. 2005: 76.12): *trayaṃ nātaḥ prthakkr̥tam* “Therefore the three are not separate.” In the *Pramāṇasamuccaya-ṭīkā* it similarly says: *trayasyāpi tattvato 'pariniṣpannatvāt, na jñānāt prthakkaraṇam* “Because those three are not truly established, they are not differentiated from knowledge.” This means that, in the context of the fourfold division of consciousness, the four aspects represent a single indivisible consciousness, or one mind.

Meanwhile, as regards Sthiramati's one-aspect theory, a headnote in the *Shindō* 新導 edition of the *Cheng weishi lun* (vol. 1: 3) states that “the master Sthiramati only posited the self-authenticating part” (安慧論師唯立自證分), and it is evident that this was the established view in Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine. However, no sources are given, and the grounds for this statement are unclear. But in the *Bukkyō taikei* 仏教大系 edition of the *Cheng weishi lun* (vol. 1: 138) we find the following quotation from the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* 成唯識論述記 (T43.241b7–9):

Sthiramati explains, saying, “[When it says in the *Cheng weishi lun*,] ‘Transformation means that the substance of consciousness evolves to resemble two parts,’ the two parts have no substance and are due to attachment to all-pervasive discrimination. Apart from a buddha, in bodhisattvas and so on the inherent substance of consciousnesses is the self-authenticating part.”

安惠解云。變謂識體轉似二分。二分體無。遍計所執。除佛以外菩薩已還。諸識自體即自證分。

If we further look for the source of the final part of this passage in the *Cheng weishi lun*, we find the following passage (T31.10b7):

The inherent substance that serves as support for the objective and seeing [parts] is called the [substratal] entity, which is the self-authenticating part.

相見所依自體名事。即自證分。

According to this passage, “inherent substance,” “[substratal] entity,” and “self-authenticating part” are all equivalent, and the single aspect of the one-aspect theory is the self-authenticating aspect of consciousness.⁷ But in the *Cheng weishi lun* there is no evidence of any intention to attribute this view to Sthiramati. A reference to “Sthiramati's one part” can also be found in another headnote of the *Shindō* edition (vol. 2: 31), but again the source is unclear. The *Bukkyō taikei* edition of the *Cheng weishi lun* (vol. 2: 129) quotes the following statement from the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* (T43.320c20–22):

But Sthiramati posited only one part, Nanda posited two parts, Dignāga posited three

parts, and Dharmapāla posited four parts.

然安惠立唯一分 難陀立二分 陳那立三分 護法立四分

Again, according to the *Cheng weishi lun shuji*, “the ancient venerables prior to Sthiramati all taught two parts” (T43.242a11–12 [cf. *Bukkyō taikei*, vol. 1: 141]: 安惠已前諸古德等皆說二分) and “alternatively, they in fact taught one part, like Sthiramati” (T43.242a24–25 [cf. *Bukkyō taikei*, vol. 1: 151]: 或實說一分如安惠). It is thus evident that the view that Sthiramati (Anhui) propounded a one-aspect theory of consciousness was the orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine. There is little clear evidence of this view in Huizhao’s 惠沼 *Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng* 成唯識論了義燈 or Zhizhou’s 智周 *Cheng weishi lun yanmi* 成唯識論演秘. A possible reason for this is that this way of thinking may have already become established as a matter of common knowledge and there was thus no need to reiterate it. In light of this circumstantial evidence, the notion that Sthiramati, Nanda, Dignāga, and Dharmapāla posited one, two, three, and four aspects of consciousness, respectively, must have originated with Kuiji. Thus, although it can be confirmed that Sthiramati was certainly familiar with the term *svasam* √*vid*, there cannot be found in extant Sanskrit texts of Sthiramati’s commentaries any evidence to corroborate the assertion that he posited only the self-authenticating aspect of consciousness, an assertion that originated with Kuiji and became the orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine.⁸

In other words, the context from which Kuiji deduced Sthiramati’s one-aspect theory of consciousness and the context in which the four-aspect theory of consciousness is explained must be considered separately. At any rate, although the four-aspect theory is explained in the *Cheng weishi lun*, there is no mention of the thesis that Sthiramati, Nanda, Dignāga, and Dharmapāla posited one, two, three, and four aspects of consciousness, respectively, and it would seem natural to assume that Kuiji came to this conclusion on the basis of a passage different from that explaining the four-aspect theory.

Next, I wish to touch on the relationship between Sthiramati and Dignāga. It is known that Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* shows a certain familiarity with the contents of Dignāga’s *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. Dignāga’s definition of *svārthānumāna* is quoted in Sthiramati’s commentary with some redactional change and without being marked as a quotation (Yamaguchi ed.: 128.20f.; Pandeya ed.: 98.15f.). The corresponding section of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* has been restored to Sanskrit from the Tibetan translation and is part of a “citation from another text used secondarily, that is not marked by the author as being a citation, with redactional change” (Steinkellner 2007: xxxv), which in this case refers to the *Pramāṇasamuccaya-vṛtti* (translated by Vasudhararakṣita; P. no. 5701, 27b7). This section of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya-vṛtti* is quoted in Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇaviniścaya* II (Steinkellner 2007: 46.3) with some redactional change and without being marked as a quotation (*trilakṣaṇāl līṅgād yad anumeye ’rthe jñānam, tat svārthānumānam*). Similarly, part of the definition of *parārthānumāna* in chapter 3 of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (*Pramāṇasamuccaya-vṛtti*, P. no. 5701, 42b8–43a1) is quoted in Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* (Yamaguchi ed.: 128.26; Pandeya ed.: 98.20) in the form *trirūpālīṅgākhyāna* without any mention of the source.

Sanskrit manuscripts of works attributed to Sthiramati continue to be discovered, and therefore the question of whether Sthiramati propounded a theory recognizing only *svasamvedana* requires further investigation, but it seems unlikely that he did so. This view would seem to be one that did not originate in India and was developed in Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, starting with Kuiji.

In the above we have surveyed the traditions underpinning the hitherto picture of Sthiramati, and it will have become evident that the narrative of Sthiramati as the author of several commentaries who was based at Valabhī, a centre of Buddhist studies on a par with Nālandā (*Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳, T54.229a5–7), and whose views were at variance with those of Dharmapāla, suggesting conflict between a Nālandā school of thought and a Valabhī school of thought, is by no means based on adequate grounds.

2. Grounds for Doubting the Existence of Only One Sthiramati

2.1. The Chinese Designations Anhui and Jianhui

It has been considered that the section on Valabhī in the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* (T50.243b9ff.) mentions “Anhui” (T50.244a9), while the section on Valabhī in the *Da Tang xiyuji* (T51.936b16ff.) refers to “Jianhui” (T51.936c2). But is this in fact the case? Furthermore, the original Sanskrit equivalent of both Anhui and Jianhui is considered to be “Sthiramati” (cf. Digital Dictionary of Buddhism). This is because, on the one hand, the Chinese transliteration given in the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* (T43.231c19–20: 三梵云悉恥羅末底。唐言安慧) suggests that Chinese “Anhui” corresponds to Sanskrit “Sthiramati,” while *sthira* has the meaning of “firm,” similar to Chinese *jian* 堅, which means that it is possible to equate Chinese “Jianhui,” too, with “Sthiramati.”

There is, however, a need to reexamine the contents of the relevant passages in the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* and *Da Tang xiyuji*. First, in the case of the former Anhui (T50.244a9) does not in fact appear in the section on Valabhī (T50.243b9–17) and is mentioned in the section on Magadha (Mojietuo 摩揭陀; T50.244a7–24) in connection with Shengjun (Jayasena), where it is stated that Shengjun, who was either Xuanzang's teacher or his associate, studied under Jiexian (Śīlabhadra) and Anhui. In other words, in the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan*, written by Huili 慧立 and edited by Yancong 彦棕 on the basis of Xuanzang's account, there is no mention of Anhui in the section on Valabhī, and consequently there is nothing to suggest any connection between Anhui and Valabhī.

Next, let us consider the reference to Jianhui in the section on Valabhī in the *Da Tang xiyuji*, which was set down in writing by Bianji 辯機 on the basis of Xuanzang's account. In the *Da Tang xiyuji*, “Dehui 德慧 (Guṇamati) and Jianhui” are mentioned as scholars at Nālandā in Magadha (T51.924a2), and they are also mentioned in the section on Valabhī (T51.936c2). In the latter case, it is stated that “the bodhisattvas Dehui and Jianhui lodged there (i.e., Valabhī)” (T51.936c2–3: 德慧堅慧菩薩之所遊止), which suggests that Jianhui was not based at Valabhī. In other words, it would seem reasonable to assume that both of them were based at Nālandā.

When we consider the contents of the above passages in the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan* and *Da Tang xiyuji*, the relationship between Anhui mentioned in the former and Jianhui mentioned in the latter turns out to be unclear.⁹

Care also needs to be taken when linking Anhui and Jianhui given as the authors of works translated into Chinese with the commentator Sthiramati. The *Dasheng fajie wuchabie lun shu* 大乘法界無差別論疏 by Fazang 法藏 equates Jianhui with Suoluomodi 娑囉末底 (T44.63c5ff.: 堅慧菩薩者。梵名娑囉末底。娑囉。此云堅固。末底云慧。.....[3c19]造究竟一乘寶性論。及法界無差別論等), which suggests Sāramati as the Sanskrit equivalent of Jianhui. When one considers that Fazang, a central figure in the Huayan 華嚴 school of Chinese Buddhism, had a tendency to attack Vijñānavāda doctrine, one needs to carefully consider whether the Sanskrit equivalent Sāramati can be accepted at face value or whether some hidden agenda should be read into it. It should also be taken into account that in this same passage Jianhui is given as the author of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, as a result of which Jianhui is mentioned chiefly in Huayan works.

Meanwhile, the grounds for equating Anhui with Sthiramati are found in the Chinese transliteration given in the *Cheng weishi lun shuji*, quoted earlier. Anyone who has examined the writings of Kuiji will not be able to deny that his writings show considerable evidence of his own intents and purposes. Therefore, care is needed when determining the reliability of his citing of this Sanskrit equivalent of Anhui.¹⁰

In view of the above circumstances, the Chinese designations Anhui and Jianhui cannot be simplistically restored to Sanskrit “Sthiramati.” This means that when the author of works in the Chinese Buddhist canon is given as Anhui or Jianhui, one cannot posit a single person named Sthiramati. This is something that needs to be borne in mind when examining works attributed to Sthiramati.

2.2. Works Attributed to Sthiramati

Works preserved in the original Sanskrit and in Tibetan (and Chinese) translation

- (1) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga*: Sanskrit text (edited by Lévi and Yamaguchi), Tibetan translation (P. no. 5534)
- (2) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Triṃśikā*: Sanskrit text (edited by Lévi), Tibetan translation (P. no. 5565), Chinese translation (T. no. 1585)
- (3) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*: Sanskrit text (edited by Kramer), Tibetan translation (P. no. 5567), Chinese translation (T. no. 1613)
- (4) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: Sanskrit text (edited by Oda-ni et al.), Tibetan translation (P. no. 5875)
- (5) *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya*: Sanskrit text (composed by Jinaputra [according to Tibetan translation]; edited by Tatia), Tibetan translation (composed by Jinaputra; P. no. 5554), Chinese translation (compiled [rou 糲] by Anhui; T. no. 1606. The existence of a Sanskrit manuscript has been reported, and it may thus be treated as a Sanskrit text compiled by Sthiramati)

Works preserved only in Tibetan translation

(6) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (P. no. 5531)

Works preserved only in Chinese translation

(7) Commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (T. no. 1567)

References to Anhui by Kuiji

(8) *Cheng weishi lun shuji* (T. no. 1830), *Weishi ershi lun shuji* 唯識二十論述記 (T. no. 1834), *Bian zhongbian lun shuji* 辯中邊論述記 (T. no. 1835), etc.

As was noted earlier, in Tibetan Buddhism questions were raised about whether the Sthiramati who wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* was the same person as the author of the other commentaries attributed to Sthiramati. Since the discovery of Sanskrit manuscripts in recent years, joint research is being conducted on the basis of manuscripts of (3) (J. Kramer 2014), (4) (Odani Nobuchiyo et al.), and (5) (Li Xuezhong of the China Tibetology Research Center et al.). Some of the researchers involved in this research are working on more than one of the texts and are in a position to exchange views with one another, and I have been informed that these works have points in common regarding Sthiramati's Sanskrit terminology and commentarial methods.

With regard to (5), Li (2011) has reported that there are two manuscripts in the Norbu-lingka Palace in Lhasa, one of which tallies with Xuanzang's translation of a work said to have been compiled by Anhui (T. no. 1606), and currently the group engaged in the study of these manuscripts considers the Sanskrit text of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* to be identical to Xuanzang's Chinese translation. This Sanskrit text is also virtually the same as the Sanskrit text attributed to Jinaputra and edited by Tatia, and in this sense it is still not known whether it contains ideas distinctive of Sthiramati. But I have been told that, in light of the current state of research, texts (1), (2) and (5) give the impression of having all been written by the same person.

If one could gather together shared tendencies through an analysis of the Sanskrit texts of (1)–(5), it would be possible to identify Sthiramati's ideas. It would presumably also be possible to discover how his interpretations differ from each of the texts on which he comments.

In the case of (6) and (7), on the other hand, of which the Sanskrit texts are not extant, there are problems concerning the translations into Tibetan and Chinese, respectively, and since the very fact that they are translations means that one cannot discount the possibility that they include the translators' own interpretations, they need to be considered on the basis of the contents of their ideas. Further, assuming that the picture of Sthiramati (Anhui) prevalent in orthodox Chinese Vijnānavāda doctrine derives to a large extent from Kuiji, (8) will need to be considered collectively.

2.3. Ideas Associated with Sthiramati

I have already published several studies dealing with those ideas to be seen in works associated with Sthiramati that are taken up below.¹¹ Therefore, I will leave details to these earlier studies and present only the main points here.

If we focus on historical changes in the development of these theories, it would seem that since the contents of Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* are similar to the orthodox views of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine originating in Xuanzang, this Sthiramati wrote this commentary near the time when Xuanzang was engaged in his translation activities. Further, the contents of Sthiramati's commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* differ in that they present only ideas that were current in an earlier period, and so it has been difficult to regard their author as having been the same as the author of the commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*.

2.3.1. Correspondences between the Four Knowledges and Eight Consciousnesses

Correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses are not found in Indian texts such as the verses of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and commentaries by Vasubandhu and Asvabhāva, the verses of the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and commentaries by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati, the verses of the *Triṃśikā* and Sthiramati's commentary, and the *Mahāyānasamgraha* and commentaries by Vasubandhu and Asvabhāva. In Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmivivakhyāna* there are found only correspondences between *ādarśajñāna* and *ālayavijñāna* and between *samatājñāna* and *kliṣṭaṃ manas*. Among Indian texts, it is only Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (preserved only in Tibetan translation) that presents the correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses. Among Chinese translations, they can be seen already in Prabhākaramitra's translation of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and Xuanzang's translation of Asvabhāva's commentary on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*. But the correspondences given in these two texts differ from the orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, with *manovijñāna* being associated with *krtyānuṣṭhānajñāna* and the five active consciousnesses with *pratyavekṣājñāna*. When Xuanzang later translated the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* by Bandhuprabha et al.,¹² he emended the above two correspondences to *manovijñāna* – *pratyavekṣājñāna* and five active consciousnesses – *krtyānuṣṭhānajñāna*. Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (ad IX.12 and also IX.61ff.) coincides with this orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine.¹³ Among Tibetan works, Ye shes sde's *Sangs rgyas gtso bo'i rgya cher 'grel pa* (P. no. 5848), dPal brtsegs's *Chos kyi rnam grangs kyi brjed byang shes bya ba* (P. no. 5849), etc., also coincide with the orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine,¹⁴ and therefore it is of course conceivable that when Sthiramati's commentary was translated into Tibetan, the translator modified the original text. But with regard to the five *gotras*, too, Sthiramati's commentary presents for the first time a five-*gotra* scheme identical to that of orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine,¹⁵ and therefore, even taking into account the fact that there are problems with the Tibetan translation,¹⁶ it may be supposed that the Sanskrit text was similar in the content of its ideas to the orthodox views of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine.

To facilitate the reader's understanding, the evolution of correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses is presented below.

(1) No references in the works of Vasubandhu and Asvabhāva, predating Śīlabhadra

(2) Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmivākyāna* (Tibetan translation)

<i>ālayavijñāna</i>	→ <i>ādarśajñāna</i>
<i>kliṣṭaṃ manas</i>	→ <i>śamatājñāna</i>
<i>manovijñāna</i>	→ ?

(3) Prabhākaramitra's translation of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and Xuanzang's translation of Asvabhāva's commentary on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*

<i>ālayavijñāna</i>	→ <i>ādarśajñāna</i>
<i>kliṣṭaṃ manas</i>	→ <i>śamatājñāna</i>
five consciousnesses	→ <i>pratyavekṣājñāna</i>
<i>manovijñāna</i>	→ <i>kṛtyānuṣṭhānajñāna</i>

(4) Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (Tibetan translation), Xuanzang's translations of the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* and *Cheng weishi lun*, Ye shes sde's *Sangs rgyas gtso bo'i rgya cher 'grel pa*, and dPal brtsegs's *Chos kyi rnam grangs kyi brjed byang shes bya ba*

<i>ālayavijñāna</i>	→ <i>ādarśajñāna</i>
<i>kliṣṭaṃ manas</i>	→ <i>śamatājñāna</i>
<i>manovijñāna</i>	→ <i>pratyavekṣājñāna</i>
five consciousnesses	→ <i>kṛtyānuṣṭhānajñāna</i>

2.3.2. Treatment of Āśraya-parivṛtti Thought

The contents of *āśraya-parivṛtti* thought can be classified into two types:

(a) *āśraya-parivṛtti* which incorporates a process of practice during which the practitioner passes through ascending stages and which involves transformation of the base of existence or a state in which the base of existence has been transformed;

(b) *āśraya-parivṛtti* which corresponds to only the final stage, a state in which the base of existence has been completely transformed and the practitioner becomes a buddha.

Āśraya-parivṛtti of the latter type is equated with *tathatā* and *dharmadhātu*. The formula stating that “the *dharmakāya* is characterized by *āśraya-parivṛtti*” holds only for type (b).

A difference in the interpretation of *āśraya-parivṛtti* can be seen in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (edited by Pradhan) and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* (edited by Tatia).¹⁷ In brief, whereas the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* adopts an interpretation of *āśraya-parivṛtti* of type (b), which does not include the process of practice,¹⁸ stages of practice can be observed in the interpretation of *āśraya-parivṛtti* in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya*, and therefore it may be considered to have adopted interpretation (a), incorporating the process of practice. The following example is taken from Sakuma 1991.

In connection with the statement in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (66.16ff.) “*duḥkhe dharmajñānaṃ katamat/ yena jñānena kṣāntyanantaraṃ vimuktiṃ sākṣātkaroti*”¹⁹ in the section on the stage of the path of insight (*darsanamārga*), the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* (77.5ff.) has: “*tasmād ucyate duḥkhe dharmajñānakṣāntir iti/ tayā kṣāntyā duḥkha-darsana-prahātavya-kleśa-prahāṇāt parivartita āśraye tadanantaraṃ yena jñānena tām āśraya-parivṛttim pratyanubhavati tad duḥkhe dharmajñānaṃ ity ucyate/*” In the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, the

path of insight is divided into the four truths (*satya*), each of which is further divided into four moments. According to the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, in the first moment of the truth of suffering one destroys the mental afflictions²⁰ to be destroyed by observing suffering, and then in the second moment one realizes (*sākṣātkaroti*) emancipation (*vimukti*) by means of the knowledge gained in the first moment. In contrast, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* brings *āśraya-parivṛtti* into the discussion. That is to say, in the first moment, as soon as suffering has been observed, the base of existence is made to undergo a change (*parivartita āśraye*), and this change is ascertained in the second moment. This means that the practitioner takes cognizance of this change, and since this may be assumed to include physical changes, it is evident that interpretation (a) of *āśraya-parivṛtti*, incorporating the process of practice, has been adopted.

In other sections, too, the interpretation of *āśraya-parivṛtti* in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-bhāṣya* incorporates the process of practice, and if the text compiled by Sthiramati adopted the Sanskrit text of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* as it stands, it would mean that his interpretation of *āśraya-parivṛtti* was one that placed emphasis on interpretation (a). It is interesting to note that this interpretation is shared with Sthiramati's commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā*, to be considered next, of which the Sanskrit texts are extant.

Whereas Sthiramati's commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* place emphasis on interpretation (a), the commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, of which the Sanskrit text is no longer extant, places emphasis on interpretation (b). Let us next consider this point.

As is the case in the Sanskrit text of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*,²¹ one can detect a verbal nuance in the noun *āśraya-parāvṛtti* as used in Sthiramati's commentary on the *Triṃśikā*. Negative elements are to be excluded (*nivṛtti*), while *parāvṛtti* is used in connection with positive elements, and in this case it must be taken in the sense of the "acquisition" of positive elements. This differs from the Sanskrit text of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, in which *parāvṛtti* is used in the sense of the "exclusion" of negative elements, while *labhyate* is used for the acquisition of positive elements. It is to be surmised that the earlier nuances of "exclude" for *parā√vṛt* and "acquire" for *pari√vṛt* were lost, and both *parā√vṛt* and *pari√vṛt* were simply used in the sense of "A turns into B."

There is no mention of *āśraya-parivṛtti* in the verses of the *Madhyāntavibhāga* or Vasubandhu's commentary, and the stages of practice are explained differently in accordance with, for example, the *trīṣvabhāva* theory. But in Sthiramati's commentary they are interpreted in terms of *āśraya-parivṛtti*. One example of this can be seen in Sthiramati's commentary on *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.16, a verse concerning *śūnyatā*, in which *āśraya+a+parā√vṛt* is explained in terms of *samālā* and *āśraya-parā√vṛt* in terms of *nirmalā*. The expression *āśraya-āparā√vṛt* does not, moreover, appear in early texts. The verb *parā√vṛt* lost its meaning of "exclude" or "acquire" and came to mean "change" in general, and it was only once the interpretation of *āśraya-parā√vṛt* had become established as that of *āśraya-parivṛtti* in the ultimate stage of practice that the expression *āparā√vṛt*, with the negative prefix *a-*, became possible. This is because it is only on the basis of interpretation (b), corresponding to ultimate *āśraya-parivṛtti*,

that a stage of practice can be referred to as a state in which no change has occurred. This would suggest that Sthiramati, cognizant of both interpretations of *āśraya-parivṛtti*, sought to read once again into *āśraya-parivṛtti*, regarding which the focus at the time was primarily on interpretation (b), the process of practice characteristic of interpretation (a).

The correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses seen in the previous section are possible only in the case of interpretation (b) of *āśraya-parivṛtti*, and it is worth noting that Sthiramati's commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* make no mention of these correspondences, which Sthiramati, who was familiar with interpretation (b), would have been sure to mention had he known of them. I previously thought that these correspondences were not dealt with in these commentaries because the base texts did not touch on *buddha-jñāna*. But now that it has become permissible to detect Sthiramati's thought in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* and it is to be surmised that he was a commentator who added his own interpretations to the texts on which he commented, it would not have been surprising had he incorporated the correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses into his commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* in the same way in which he incorporated them into his commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, correspondences that had not been present in Asvabhāva's commentary and earlier.

3. Was There Really Only One Commentator Named Sthiramati?

The commentator here under consideration is the Sthiramati who wrote commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, *Triṃśikā*, and *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*.

(1) Even if one takes into account the fact that the former two commentaries incorporate the full scheme of eight consciousnesses, they postdate Vasubandhu, and since the Sthiramati who wrote the commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* was familiar with the contents of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, he must postdate Dignāga. But in view of the fact that neither of these two commentaries gives any indication of the correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses, they presumably predate Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna*. If Śīlabhadra was a leading scholar at Nālandā, there is a possibility that this scheme of correspondences was brought to completion after his composition of the *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna* but during Xuanzang's sojourn in Nālandā. But this scheme of correspondences differs from that of orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine. The commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, which gives the same scheme of correspondences as that of orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, contains ideas close to those of the time when Xuanzang began his translations.

(2) As for the Sthiramati mentioned in the inscriptions from Valabhī, it would not pose any problems if the Sthiramati predating 588 C.E. and the Sthiramati predating 662 C.E. were different people. Moreover, were one to posit the Sthiramati predating 588 C.E. as the author of the commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* and the Sthiramati predating 662 C.E. as the author of the commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, one would be able to delineate an ideal chronology. There is, however, no evidence for directly linking these two

Sthiramatis to the former two commentaries and the third commentary, respectively. And, of course, I have no intention whatsoever of asserting that the author of the commentaries on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and *Triṃśikā* was the Sthiramati predating 588 C.E. and the author of the commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* was the Sthiramati predating 662 C.E.

The aim of the above investigations has been to demonstrate that, even when considered only in light of the above circumstantial evidence, the hitherto tacit understanding that there must have been only one Sthiramati has been acting as a sort of straitjacket. Taking into account the continuing discovery of Sanskrit manuscripts, and having freed ourselves from this straitjacket, we need to delineate a fresh picture of Sthiramati by carefully reexamining not only the above three commentaries, but also the contents of the other works listed in § 2.2. If, as a result of further investigations, it is established that all of these works were written by a single person named Sthiramati, then so be it. But at least as matters currently stand, it is, I believe, difficult to suppose that the Anhui described in orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine deriving from Kuiji, the Sthiramati mentioned in extant Sanskrit texts, and the commentator Sthiramati who wrote a commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* preserved only in Tibetan translation were one and the same person. It is for this reason that I intend to continue pursuing research on Sthiramati from such a viewpoint in collaboration with other researchers.

Postscript

This article is a translation of a slightly modified version of an earlier article of mine (Sakuma 2013a); in particular, the section on *kliṣṭa-manas* has been omitted because I noticed some shortcomings in its arguments. Born out of the research project “A Comprehensive Study of Sthiramati’s Thought,” funded with a grant-in-aid for scientific research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (research project no. 25284020), Sakuma 2013a delineated the kinds of problems that are associated with Sthiramati. I subsequently set about preparing another article titled “Was Sthiramati of Valabhī the Same Person as the Commentator Sthiramati?” (to be published in *Sambhāṣā* 36, 2020) as part of the research project “A Comprehensive Elucidation of the Relationship between the Commentator Sthiramati, Anhui of Faxiang Doctrine, and Jianhui of Valabhī,” funded with another grant-in-aid for scientific research (research project no. 17K02213), with the aim of demonstrating that Jianhui of Valabhī was a different person from the commentator Sthiramati and the figure Anhui mentioned in Chinese Vijñānavāda (Faxiang 法相) doctrine. But in the course of preparing this latter article, it became clear that Sakuma 2013a presented in a comprehensive fashion information that was indispensable as a premise for this latter article. Because Sakuma 2013a had been written in Japanese and was not accessible to those unable to read Japanese, I decided to revise those parts regarding which fresh information, mainly concerning Japanese research, had since come to light and have it translated into English. (It is for this reason that I do not refer to studies in English, etc., such as those by Jonathan Silk, Jowita Kramer, and others.) In particular, I wish to draw attention to the following two pieces of information that are important for the article focusing on Jianhui.

First, I have learnt that the *Apidamo zaji lun* 阿毘達磨雜集論, which Xuanzang translated as a work “compiled by Anhui,” tallies with a Sanskrit manuscript that Li Xuezhong of the China Tibetology Research Center is in the process of editing, but regrettably the edited text has not yet been published. I myself have been unable to view the manuscript, but according to researchers who have been collaborating in editing the text, the manuscript itself does not appear to mention the name “Sthiramati.” It has become clear, in other words, that it has been provisionally attributed to Sthiramati only because the manuscript’s contents tally with Xuanzang’s translation. If it were explicitly stated in the manuscript that it had been written by Sthiramati, it would provide material evidence that Xuanzang had rendered “Sthiramati” as “Anhui,” but currently it is attributed to Sthiramati only because Xuanzang translated the compiler’s name as “Anhui.” In this sense, the grounds for supposing that the author of the original Sanskrit text of the *Apidamo zaji lun* was Sthiramati are merely circumstantial. But in view of the fact that this is the sole, important instance in which Xuanzang used the designation “Anhui” and it has been established by and large that this work is close in content to other Sanskrit works attributed to Sthiramati, it proves that Xuanzang knew of the existence of the commentator Sthiramati. It means, in other words, that Xuanzang differentiated between Sthiramati of Valabhī and the commentator Sthiramati.

Secondly, I wish to touch on the fact that there are two Sanskrit equivalents of the Chinese designation “Jianhui,” namely, Sthiramati and Sāramati. For the reasons explained earlier, Sthiramati of Valabhī was translated as “Jianhui” by Xuanzang, but, as noted, his disciple Kuiji not only gave the Chinese equivalent of the Chinese transliteration of “Sthiramati” as “Anhui,” but also added further details about him which Xuanzang had not mentioned at all. This shows that Kuiji failed to understand Xuanzang’s intentions and consequently confused Jianhui of Valabhī with Anhui of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine. In the history of Chinese Buddhism, the designation “Jianhui” has been used chiefly in the current of studies of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* (*Huayan jing* 華嚴經), and it is said that “Jianhui” corresponds to Sanskrit “Sāramati,” which means that he was a separate person from Sthiramati. Fazang was severely critical of the Chinese Vijñānavāda school and also attributed the *Ratnagotravibhāga* to Jianhui, as a result of which in studies of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* Jianhui came to be regarded as a proponent of *tathāgatagarbha* thought. It was for this reason that the Japanese scholar-monk Fujaku 普寂, who belonged to this current of *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* studies, stated in his *Ken’yō shōbō fukko shū* 顯揚正法復古集 that “the two great men Maming (*Āśvaghoṣa) and Jianhui expounded *tathāgatagarbha*” (*Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書 29: 177c—馬鳴・堅慧二大士則説如來藏). In June 2018 Kitsukawa Chishō presented a paper titled “Reexamining the Yogācāra Lineage” at the annual conference of the Society for Buzan Studies, and because it has important bearings on my forthcoming article on Jianhui, including the influence of this Huayan lineage (Kitsukawa 2019). Taking this into account, my forthcoming article will demonstrate that Jianhui of Valabhī was a completely different person from the commentator Sthiramati and the Anhui of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine.

In this forthcoming article, I discuss why Jianhui of Valabhī, the commentator Sthiramati,

and Anhui of Chinese and Japanese Vijñānavāda doctrine came to be confused with one another. First, I argue that it can be inferred from the *Da Tang xiyuji*, etc., that Xuanzang deliberately translated the name of Sthiramati of Valabhī as “Jianhui,” not “Anhui,” because he knew of the existence of a person called Sthiramati in Valabhī, such as is mentioned in the copperplate inscriptions, but realized that he was a different person from the commentator Sthiramati. As well, it can also be inferred from the *Da Tang xiyuji*, etc., that although Xuanzang knew there were monasteries in Valabhī, he did not evince any great interest in them. Secondly, contrary to Xuanzang’s intentions, his disciple Kuiji retranslated the name of Sthiramati of Valabhī as “Anhui” and stated that he was the Anhui who had been in conflict with the Dharmapāla of the Vijñānavāda school, whereafter Yijing 義淨 endorsed this in his *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan*, and it would seem that as a result there was established a schema of doctrinal controversy between Sthiramati and Dharmapāla. It is to be surmised that in modern times the well-known mnemonic about the four aspects of consciousness transmitted by the Japanese Hossō sect and the Jianhui mentioned by Fujaku became mixed up and in Japanese Buddhist studies Jianhui of Valabhī, the commentator Sthiramati, and Anhui of Vijñānavāda doctrine all came to be regarded as one and the same person. If Buddhist studies in Europe at the time had learnt of Kuiji’s and Yijing’s accounts directly from their writings, it would mean that Stanislas Julien restored the name Jianhui as “Sthiramati” in his French translation of the *Da Tang xiyuji* independently of Japanese traditions. But when one takes into account the fact that in his English translation of the *Da Tang xiyuji* Samuel Beal makes special mention of B. Nanjio, i.e., Nanjō Bun’yū 南條文雄, who was familiar with these Japanese traditions, it would seem that the above confusion became firmly entrenched on account of statements by Bühler and Japanese Hossō doctrine. This point is demonstrated in my forthcoming article on Jianhui.

It should be noted that, owing to questions concerning its content, § 2.3.3 on *kliṣṭaṃ manas* in Sakuma 2013a has been omitted in this English version. I would also like to thank Rolf Giebel for having undertaken the translation.

References

- Albiruni’s India—An Account of the Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Geography, Chronology, Astronomy, Customs, Laws and Astrology of India about A.D. 1030*. Vol. 2, edited and translated by Edward C. Sachau. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1888.
- Bühler, G. 1877. “Further Valabhī Grants.” *The Indian Antiquary* VI: 9–10.
- Cook, Francis H., trans. 1999. *Three Texts on Consciousness Only*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 60-I, II, III. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Ejima Yasunori 江島恵教. 2003 [1992]. “Bāvivēka no gengokan—yugagyō gakusetsu hihan to no kanren ni oite” バーヴィヴェーカの言語観—瑜伽行学説批判との関連において [Bhāvivēka’s view of language: In connection with his criticism of Yogācāra theories]. In id., *Kū to chūgan* 空と中観 [Emptiness and Madhyamaka], 521–542. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1961. “Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die*

- Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 5: 125–148.
- Hattori, Masaaki. 1968. *Dignāga, On Perception: Being the Pratyakṣaṣāpariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit Fragments and the Tibetan Versions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1979. *Indo Bukkyō shi* インド仏教史 [A history of Indian Buddhism], vol. 2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Kajiya Yūichi 梶山雄一. 1963. “Shōben, Anne, Gohō” 清弁・安慧・護法 [Bhāṇiveka, Sthiramati, and Dharmapāla]. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 64/65: 114–159.
- Kishine Toshiyuki 岸根敏幸. 2001. *Chandorakīruti no chūgan shisō* チャンドラキールティの中観思想 [Candrakīrti's Mādhyamika thought]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Kitsukawa Chishō 橘川智昭. 2019. “Yuishiki keifu kō” 唯識系譜考 [Reexamining the Yogācāra lineage]. *Buzan Kyōgaku Taikai Kiyō* 豊山教学大会紀要 47: 47–73.
- Kramer, Jowita. 2014. *Sthiramati's Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*, 2 pts. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House; Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1896. “Les donations religieuses des rois de Valabhi.” *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, sciences religieuses* 7, *Études de critique et d'histoire*, 2nd ser.: 75–100.
- Li Xuezhu 李学竹. 2011. “Abhidharmasamuccaya oyobi sono chūshaku (*Vyākhyā*) no shinshutsu bonbun shahon ni tsuite” *Abhidharmasamuccaya* およびその注釈 (*Vyākhyā*) の新出梵文写本について [Newly available Sanskrit manuscripts of Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and Sthiramati's *Vyākhyā* from the Tibet Autonomous Region]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 60-1: 403–406.
- . 2014. “Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves from Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya*—Folios 29, 33, 39, 43, 44.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 17: 195–205.
- Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎. 1926. *Tōyō bunka no kenkyū* 東洋文化の研究 [Studies in Oriental culture]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Njammasch, Marlene. 2001. *Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen: Das frühe Mittelalter in Gujarat*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Obermiller, E. 1932. *History of Buddhism (Chos ḥbyung) by Bu-ston: II. The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. Heidelberg: In Kommission bei O. Harrassowitz.
- Roerich, George N. 1949. *The Blue Annals*. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Sakuma Hidenori 佐久間秀範. 1984. “‘Chī’ to ‘shiki’—ryōsha no ketsugō kankei to sono seiritsu katei” <智>と<識>—両者の結合関係とその成立過程 [*Jñāna* and *vijñāna*: On the development of their interconnections]. *Buzan Gakuhō* 豊山学報 28/29: 125–141.
- . 1991. “Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam ni okeru tenne shisō” *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam*における転依思想 [*Āśraya-parāvṛtti* thought in the *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣyam*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 40-1: 372–378.
- . 1996. “*Daijō shōgonkyōron* ni okeru tenne shisō—parāvṛtti no shiyō patān ni tsuite” 『大乘莊嚴經論』における転依思想—parāvṛttiの使用パターンについて [The *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*: A *parāvṛttau* B *labhyate*]. In *Imani-*

- shi Junkichi kyōju kanreki kinen ronshū: Indo shisō to Bukkyō bunka* 今西順吉教授還暦記念論集・インド思想と仏教文化 [Indian thought and Buddhist culture: Essays in honour of Professor Imanishi Junkichi on his 60th birthday], 568–557. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- . 2007. “In Search of the Origins of the Five-Gotra System.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 54-3: 1112–1120.
- . 2011. “The Historical Development of the *Āśrayaparivṛtti* Theory.” *Sambhāṣā (Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism)* 29: 39–59.
- . 2012. “Yugagyō yuishiki shisō to wa nani ka” 瑜伽行唯識思想とは何か [What is Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda thought?]. In *Yuishiki to yugagyō* 唯識と瑜伽行 [Vijñānavāda and Yogācāra], vol. 7 of *Shirīzu Daijō Bukkyō* シリーズ大乘仏教 [Series on Mahāyāna Buddhism], 19–72. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- . 2013a. “Chūshakuka Sūtiramati wa hitori ka?” 註釈家ステイラマティは一人か? [Was there really only one commentator named Sthiramati?]. *Bukkyōgaku* 仏教学 55: (59)–(86).
- . 2013b. “Mushō to Anne” 無性と安慧 [Asvabhāva and Sthiramati]. In *Itō Zuiei hakushi koki kinen ronshū: Hokke Bukkyō to kankei shobunka no kenkyū* 伊藤瑞叡博士古稀記念論集 法華仏教と関係諸文化の研究 [Studies of Lotus Sutra Buddhism and related cultures: Essays in honour of Dr. Itō Zuiei on his 70th birthday], 747–765. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1987. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*, 2 pts. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Steinkellner, Ernst. 2007. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavinīścaya: Chapters 1 and 2*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House; Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- , Helmut Krasser and Horst Lasic. 2005. *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmalavātī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā: Chapter 1, Part 1*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House; Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Teramoto Enga 寺本婉雅. 1974. *Tāranāta Indo Bukkyōshi* ターラナータ印度仏教史 [Tāranātha's history of Indian Buddhism]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会.
- Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥. 1996. *Indo Bukkyō himei no kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘の研究 [A comprehensive study of the Indian Buddhist inscriptions]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平樂寺書店.
- Ueno Yasuhiro 上野康弘. 2011. “Zōyaku Shōgon kyōron Anne shaku ni okeru chosha mondai—Anne saku to suru koto e no jakkan no gimon” 蔵訳『莊嚴經論安慧釈』における著者問題—安慧作とすることへの若干の疑問 [Some questions concerning Sthiramati's authorship of the *Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 60-1: 445–449.
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿. 1965a. “Genjō izen no Indo shorōnji no nendai” 玄奘以前の印度諸論師の年代 [The dates of Indian masters predating Xuanzang]. In id., *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* 印度哲学研究 [Studies in Indian philosophy], vol. 5: 109–161. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- . 1965b. “Yugagyōha ni okeru ni keitō” 瑜伽行派に於ける二系統 [Two lineages in the Yogācāra school]. In id., *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, vol. 6: 500–540.
- Wogihara, U., ed. 1932. *Abhisamayālamkāra'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā, the Work of Harib-*

hadra. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.

Yamaguchi Susumu 山口益. 1941. *Bukkyō ni okeru mu to u to no tairon* 仏教における無と有との対論 [Controversy about being and nonbeing in Buddhism]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

———. 1996. *Sthiramati, Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā: Exposition systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.

Yasui Kōsai 安井広済. 1961. *Chūgan shisō no kenkyū* 中觀思想の研究 [Studies in Mādhyamika thought]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Yoshimura Makoto 吉村誠. 1995. “*Daitō Daijionji sanzō hōshi den* no seiritsu ni tsuite” 『大唐大慈恩寺三蔵法師伝』の成立について [On the composition of the *Da Tang Daci'ensi sanzang fashi zhuan*]. *Bukkyōgaku* 37: 79–113.

———. 2013. “Genjō shoden no Yugagyōha no keifu—*Daitō saikiiki* o chūshin ni” 玄奘所伝の瑜伽行派の系譜—『大唐西域記』を中心に [The lineages of Yogācāra according to Xuanzang: With a focus on the *Da Tang xiyuji*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 62-1: 20–27.

Yūki Reimon 結城令聞. 1999 [1980]. “Kinsei yuishiki kenkyū no aru keifu ni tsuite no hyōron” 近世唯識研究の或る系譜についての評論 [An assessment of a certain lineage in early modern Vijñānavāda studies]. In id., *Kegon shisō* 華嚴思想 [Huayan thought], vol. 2 of *Yūki Reimon chosaku senshū* 結城令聞著作選集 [Selected works of Yūki Reimon], 469–484. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Notes

¹ According to Matsumoto Bunzaburō (1926: 34–45), Xuanzang’s age at the time of his death is to be calculated in the following way. All traditional biographies of Xuanzang agree that he was ordained in Wude 武德 5 (622) at the age of twenty (or twenty-one by traditional reckoning), and since this tallies with Xuanzang’s statement in Linde 麟德 1 (664) shortly before his death that “my age is sixty-three” (吾行年六十有三), Matsumoto determined that, counting backwards, Xuanzang must have been born in Renshou 仁壽 2 (602). The statement “my age is sixty-three” is recorded in the *Da Tang gu sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang*, which records Xuanzang’s words and deeds on his deathbed and is therefore the most reliable record in this regard. Confusion regarding Xuanzang’s age at the time of his death subsequently arose because in his biography of Xuanzang in the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 Daoxuan 道宣 suggested that he died at the age of sixty-five (行年六十有五矣). But Matsumoto argues convincingly that the figure “five” (五) is a scribal error for “three” (三), a view that has also been endorsed by Yoshimura (1995: 101–102), and it is now established that Xuanzang’s dates were 602–664. These dates had already been established when Uī wrote his 1965a article.

² Yuiki identified a passage in the *Shōdaijōronshaku ryakusho* 攝大乘論釋略疏 by Fujaku 普寂 (1707–81) (T. no. 2269, 68.121b22ff.) as the source of the legend that “Paramārtha belonged to Anhui’s lineage.”

³ The Sthiramati mentioned in the *Blue Annals* (Roerich 1949) either has ties with Valabhī or is not a commentator, and therefore he would seem to be a different person from the Sthiramati here under consideration.

⁴ See Sakuma 2012: 34–35.

⁵ See Hattori 1968: 110n1.74. The corresponding passage in Jinendrabuddhi's *Viśālāmalavatī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* cited by Hattori appears in Steinkellner et al. 2005: 83.14ff.—*svasaṃvedyatā vety anenāntaroktāyā evopapatteḥ sādhyāntaram āha/ na kevalaṃ smṛter uttarakālaṃ dvairūpyaṃ siddhaṃ jñānasya, api tu svasaṃvedanam api*,... The existence of *svasaṃ*√*vid* can thus be confirmed. In addition, there also appear *svasaṃvitti* (ibid.: 69.5 [I.9a]) and *svasaṃvedana* (ibid.: 69.14 [I.9ab]), and the original Sanskrit equivalents of *zizheng fen* 自證分 (self-authentication) can be ascertained in Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.

⁶ Here and below, English translations of quotations from the *Cheng weishi lun* have been adapted from Cook 1999: 62–64.

⁷ Here I have sought out passages in the *Cheng weishi lun* that might corroborate the headnote in the *Shindō* edition (vol. 1: 3). But if we examine the text of the *Cheng weishi lun* without any such ulterior motives, there are passages in which it would seem possible to assign the “one part” to something other than “self-authentication.” In other words, rather than being an interpretation based on the *Cheng weishi lun* itself, there is a strong possibility that the orthodox view of Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, equating Anhui's “one part” with “self-authentication,” derives from Kuiji's interpretation.

⁸ Sthiramati's commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* (Yamaguchi ed.: 162.17; Pandeya ed.: 122.16) has *svasaṃvedyā ity ākhyātum āśakyatvād udgraha ucyate*/, but this is unrelated to the one-aspect theory. No expressions related to *svasaṃ*√*vid* are to be found in Sthiramati's commentary on the *Triṃśikā* (Lévi ed.) or in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* (attributed to Jinaputra; ed. Tatia).

⁹ On the designations Anhui and Dehui, including their Sanskrit equivalents, see Yoshimura 2013.

¹⁰ What follows is mere speculation, but when one disregards the referents of “Anhui” and “Jianhui” and considers them purely as Chinese designations, one finds that they appear in a list of bodhisattvas at the start of the *Zhengqi dasheng jing* 證契大乘經 (T. no. 674, 16.653a14–18: 其名曰聖者彌勒菩薩。大慧菩薩。勝慧菩薩。堅慧菩薩。寂慧菩薩。無盡慧菩薩。無邊慧菩薩。海慧菩薩。安慧菩薩。無垢慧菩薩。智慧菩薩)。This sūtra is said to have been translated by the Indian Trepitaka Divākara during the Tang period, and in this case “Jianhui” and “Anhui” must have corresponded to different Sanskrit names. However, in the *Dasheng tongxing jing* 大乘同性經, considered to be another translation of the same text by the Indian Trepitaka Jñānayaśas during the Northern Zhou dynasty, the same passage is rendered somewhat differently (T. no. 673, 16.640c17–22: 其名曰聖者彌勒菩薩摩訶薩。大意菩薩摩訶薩。益意菩薩摩訶薩。堅意菩薩摩訶薩。定意菩薩摩訶薩。無盡意菩薩摩訶薩。無邊意菩薩摩訶薩。海意菩薩摩訶薩。正定意菩薩摩訶薩。淨意菩薩摩訶薩。智意菩薩摩訶薩)。In this case, too, the original Sanskrit names must have been different, although I have no intention of linking them to Sthiramati and Sāramati. Xuanzang himself translated the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya* as a work “compiled by the Bodhisattva Anhui,” and although it may be possible to equate this Anhui with the Sthiramati here under consideration, the problem is that, because there is a possibility that Fazang was involved in the translation of the *Zhengqi dasheng jing*, one cannot discount the possibility that he had some reason for presenting a transliteration corresponding to Sāramati in his *Dasheng fajie wuchabie lun shu*. It is, at any rate, evident that it is a quite risky undertaking to determine the original Sanskrit equivalent from Chinese translations.

¹¹ On correspondences between the four knowledges and eight consciousnesses, see Sakuma 2012; on the

treatment of *āśraya-parāvṛtti*, see Sakuma 2011; and on the treatment of *kliṣṭaṃ manas*, see Sakuma 2013b.

¹² Together with specialists in Indian, Tibetan, and Chinese Buddhism, I am currently engaged in a joint comparative study of the Tibetan translation of Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna* and Xuanzang's translation of the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* by Bandhuprabha et al. It is well known that Xuanzang's translation contains a great many additional passages when compared with the Tibetan translation. But even if it is true that Xuanzang's translations of those passages tallying with the Tibetan translation were modified in line with his own aims, it is becoming clear in light of the extremely close correspondences between the two translations that Xuanzang used Śīlabhadra's *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna* as his base text, to which he added additional passages summarizing the wealth of knowledge he had absorbed during his stay in India. Most of the passages tallying with the *Buddhabhūmividyākhyāna* did not become part of orthodox Chinese Vijñānavāda doctrine, and this was perhaps one of the reasons that Xuanzang attributed the *Buddhabhūmiśāstra* to "Bandhuprabha et al." rather than to his own teacher Śīlabhadra.

¹³ See Sakuma 2012: 41–48.

¹⁴ See Sakuma 1984: 136–137.

¹⁵ See Sakuma 2007.

¹⁶ As noted in Ueno 2011, the Tibetan translator himself states in his colophon that he was unable to fully understand Sthiramati's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, and it cannot be guaranteed that the Tibetan translation faithfully reflects the contents of the original Sanskrit text.

¹⁷ See Sakuma 1991.

¹⁸ As pointed out in Sakuma 1991, as far as I can tell, in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* *āśraya-parāvṛtti* is mentioned in five passages, all of which may be assumed to reflect interpretation (b): (1) *nirantarāśraya-parāvṛtti* in the section on *niṣṭhāmārga*, (2) three kinds of *āśraya-parāvṛtti* in the section on *nirantarāśraya-parāvṛtti*, (3) *kārya-pariniṣṭhā* as the fourth of the four *vyāpyālamkāra*, (4) *āśraya* as the fifth of the five *yogabhūmi*, and (5) the first item in the section on *phalaviśeṣa*.

¹⁹ Emended on the basis of Li 2014: 197; Wogihara 1932: 170.

²⁰ "Mental affliction" has been provisionally used to translate *kleśa*. Cf. Schmithausen 1987, 2: 246–247n21.

²¹ See Sakuma 1996.